

REMARKS

In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to the disclosure because of certain informalities. Applicants have amended the disclosure to set forth the specification number in line 51 page 2 of the specification and to correct the typographical errors on page 2 and page 10. Applicants request that the Examiner's objection to the disclosure be withdrawn.

Claims 1-30 are pending in the present application. In the Office Action, the Examiner objected to claim 8 because it allegedly lacked antecedent basis for the phrase "the electrical contact." Applicants have amended claim 8 to correct the antecedent basis. The Examiner also indicated that claim 8 appeared to be the same as claim 2. Applicants respectfully disagree and note that claim 8 sets forth, among other things, "at least one second electrical contact optionally electrically coupled to the first electrical contact." Accordingly, Applicants believe that claim 2 and claim 8 are not the same.

In the Office Action, claims 1-14 and 18-24 were provisionally rejected under 35 USC 101 as claiming the same invention as that of claims 1-11 and 13-19 of co-pending Application No. 10/679,180. Applicants respectfully disagree. The present invention sets forth an interconnect for an attitude control device such as may be deployed on a missile, whereas claims 1-11 and 13-19 of co-pending Application No. 10/679,180 set forth an interconnect for a location dependent device, such as may be deployed on an automobile. Applicants respectfully submit that the structure of an interconnect for an attitude control device (as set forth in claim 1-14 and 18-24) is not the same as the structure of an interconnect that may be used with any location dependent device. For example, the interconnect for the attitude control device should be able to withstand the effects of launch and/or flight, which can be quite severe. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully submit that claims 1-14 and 18-24 do not claim the same invention as claims 1-11

and 13-19 of co-pending Application No. 10/679,180 and request that the Examiner's rejections of these claims under 35 USC 101 be withdrawn.

In the Office Action, claims 25-26 were provisionally rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 19 of U.S. Patent Application No. 10/679,180. In the interest of expediency, Applicant has included herein a terminal disclaimer and respectfully requests that the Examiner's rejection of claims 25-26 be withdrawn. However, it will be appreciated that the filing of the terminal disclaimer to obviate the Examiner's rejection is not an admission of the propriety of the rejection. *Quad Environmental Technologies Corp. vs. Union Sanitary District*, 946 F.2d 870, 20 USPQ2d 1392 (Fed Cir. 1991). See, e.g., MPEP §804.03.

In the Office Action, claims 1-3, 5-6, 8, 14, 18-19, and 22-24 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as allegedly being anticipated by Card, et al (U.S. Patent No. 5,576,698). Claims 4, 7, 15-17, and 27-30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly being unpatentable over Card. The Examiner's rejections are respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 1 and 18 set forth, among other things, a plurality of electrical contacts capable of providing a signal indicative of a physical location of an attitude control device when the attitude control device is installed. In contrast, Card describes a technique for indicating an address of a module connected to a bus using a plurality of pins. See Card, Figures 3 and 4, and related discussion. The address described by Card is a bus address and not an address indicating a physical location. Card is completely silent with regard to the physical location of the modules coupled to the bus. To the contrary, the device described by Card is only concerned with the logical address of the module and the physical location of the module is irrelevant.


Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the pending claims are not obvious in view of Card. To establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the prior art reference (or references when combined) must teach or suggest all the claim limitations. *In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981, 180 U.S.P.Q. 580 (CCPA 1974). As discussed above, Card is completely silent with regard to the physical location of the modules coupled to the bus and therefore fails to teach or suggest a plurality of electrical contacts capable of providing a signal indicative of a physical location of an attitude control device when the attitude control device is installed, as set forth in independent claims 1 and 18. Accordingly, Card also fails to provide any suggestion or motivation to modify the prior art directed to arrive at the claimed invention.

For at least the aforementioned reasons, Applicants respectfully submit that the Examiner has failed to make a *prima facie* case that the present invention is obvious over Card. Applicants request that the Examiner's rejections of claims 4, 7, 15-17, and 27-30 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) be withdrawn.

For the aforementioned reasons, it is respectfully submitted that all claims pending in the present application are in condition for allowance. The Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at (713) 934-4052 with any questions, comments or suggestions relating to the referenced patent application.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 9/15/05


Mark W. Sincell, Ph.D.
Reg. No. 52,226
Williams Morgan & Amerson, P.C.
10333 Richmond Avenue, Suite 1100
Houston, TX 77042
(713) 934-7000
(713) 934-7011 (Fax)
AGENT FOR APPLICANTS